

STATE OF LOUISIANA LEGISLATIVE AUDITOR

1998 ACTUARIAL REPORT ON LOUISIANA PUBLIC RETIREMENT SYSTEMS

August 1999



Legislative Actuary

Daniel G. Kyle, Ph.D., CPA, CFE
Legislative Auditor

LEGISLATIVE RETIREMENT COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN

**Honorable Victor T. Stelly, Chairman
House Retirement Committee**

**Honorable Francis C. Heitmeier, Chairman
Senate Retirement Committee**

LEGISLATIVE AUDITOR

Daniel G. Kyle, Ph.D., CPA, CFE

LEGISLATIVE ACTUARY

John E. Sondergaard, EA, MAAA, FCA

ACTUARIAL MANAGER

Thomas N. Rice, EA, MAAA, ASA

This document is produced by the Legislative Auditor, State of Louisiana, Post Office Box 94397, Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804-9397 in accordance with Louisiana Revised Statute 24:513. Fifty copies of this public document were produced at an approximate cost of \$225.79. This material was produced in accordance with the standards for state agencies established pursuant to R.S. 43:31.

In compliance with the Americans With Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance relative to this document, or any documents of the Legislative Auditor, please contact Wayne "Skip" Irwin, Director of Administration, at 225/339-3800.

1998 ACTUARIAL REPORT
ON
LOUISIANA PUBLIC
RETIREMENT SYSTEMS

August 1999

1998 ACTUARIAL REPORT

LOUISIANA PUBLIC RETIREMENT SYSTEMS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Legislative Actuary's Transmittal Letter

	<u>PAGE(S)</u>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1-11

EMPLOYER FUNDING FOR PENSION BENEFITS

1. Funding Methods	12
2. Employer Contribution Rates	14
3. Contribution Sources	16
4. Contribution History	19
5. Funding Measure Under GASB	20
6. Funded Ratios as of June 30, 1998	22
7. UAL Balances	25
8. Texaco Settlement	27
9. Experience Account Summary	29
10. Insurance Premium Tax Fund - Assessments	31
11. Asset Balances as of June 30, 1998	33
12. Investment Returns	35
13. Participant Census as of July 30, 1998	36

BENEFIT FORMULAS AND EMPLOYEE CONTRIBUTIONS

1. Benefit Accrual Rates	37
2. Benefits	41

ACTUARIAL CONCERNS -- FUNDING ISSUES

1. Funding of UAL for State Systems	43
2. Operation of Experience Account	46
3. Change in Asset Funding Method	48
4. Approval Process for Actuarial Reports	49
5. Funding of Optional Retirement Plan	50
6. Demographic Experience - TRSL	51
7. Plan Demographics	52
8. Impact of COLA Increases on Retiree Benefits	55
9. Minimum Employer Contribution Limits Under State Constitution	58



OFFICE OF
LEGISLATIVE AUDITOR
STATE OF LOUISIANA
BATON ROUGE, LOUISIANA 70804-9397

DANIEL G. KYLE, PH.D., CPA, CFE
LEGISLATIVE AUDITOR

1600 NORTH THIRD STREET
POST OFFICE BOX 94397
TELEPHONE: (504) 339-3800
FACSIMILE: (504) 339-3870

August 17, 1999

The Honorable M. J. "Mike" Foster
Governor of the State of Louisiana
The Honorable Randy L. Ewing
President of the Senate

The Honorable H.B. "Hunt" Downer, Jr.
Speaker of the House of Representatives

**RE: 1998 Annual Actuarial Report
on Louisiana Public Retirement Systems**

Gentlemen:


The Office of the Legislative Auditor is pleased to submit the 1998 Annual Actuarial Report on Louisiana Public Retirement Systems in accordance with Louisiana statutes R.S. 24:513C(1) and R.S. 11:271C(2). This report summarizes the financial status of the thirteen state and statewide retirement systems as of June 30, 1998. The report includes the following sections:

- **Executive Summary**
- **Employer Funding for Pension Benefits**
- **Benefit Formulas and Employee Contributions**
- **Actuarial Concerns – Funding Issues**

Please direct any questions concerning this report to:

Mr. John E. Sondergaard
Legislative Actuary
Post Office Box 94397
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804-9397

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
JOHN E. SONDERGAARD, EA, MAAA, FCA - LEGISLATIVE ACTUARY
OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE AUDITOR

JES:pm
Enclosure

cc: Dr. Daniel G. Kyle
Legislative Auditor

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE AUDITOR ACTUARIAL DIVISION

1998 Actuarial Report on Louisiana Public Retirement Systems

Purpose of Report

Louisiana Statutes

Pursuant to *Louisiana Statutes*, the Legislative Auditor must submit periodic reports to the governor and the legislature detailing the financial and actuarial history of the Louisiana Public Retirement Systems. The reports shall also include comments on any findings that may materially affect the actuarial soundness of the retirement systems.

1998 Report

The 1998 Actuarial Report on Louisiana Public Retirement Systems was prepared by the legislative actuary for the legislature, the governor, and other interested parties involved in the retirement systems' decision making process. This comprehensive actuarial report summarizes the financial status of the thirteen state and statewide retirement systems as of June 30, 1998. It also outlines matters for legislative review that would enhance the stability and funding of the public retirement systems. The report includes data for the four state retirement systems and nine statewide retirement systems.

State Systems

For the four state retirement systems, benefits are guaranteed under the state constitution.

LASERS - Louisiana State Employees' Retirement System

TRSL - Teachers' Retirement System of Louisiana

STPOL - State Police Pension and Retirement System

LSERS - Louisiana School Employees' Retirement System

Statewide Systems

For the nine statewide retirement systems, benefits are not guaranteed under the state constitution.

ASSR - Louisiana Assessors' Retirement Fund

CCRS - Clerks of Court Retirement and Relief Fund

DARS - District Attorneys' Retirement System

FRS - Firefighters' Retirement System

MERS - Municipal Employees' Retirement System - Plans A&B

MPERS - Municipal Police Employees' Retirement System

PERS - Parochial Employees' Retirement System - Plans A&B

RVRS - Registrars of Voters Employees' Retirement System

SPRF - Sheriffs' Pension and Relief Fund

Overall Funding for Pension Benefits*Actuarial Funding*

The accumulation of assets required to fund any retirement program is contingent upon the actuarial cost method used by each system, the actuarial assumptions employed in the actuarial calculations, and the asset valuation method adopted in the valuation process. Of primary importance is the selection of interest rate assumptions, which includes an inflation component. Interest rates used in the 1998 valuation of the thirteen state and statewide plans range from 7.0% to 8.25%. Overall funding for the thirteen retirement systems has improved considerably for the ten fiscal years 1989 through 1998. Much of the improvement can be attributed to favorable investment performance and actuarial funding mandated under the constitution.

Contributions

Pension benefit liabilities for all thirteen state and statewide retirement systems are funded through contributions from employers, members, various taxes, revenue sharing funds, and through investment earnings on plan assets.

Employer contribution rates are actuarially determined each year through an actuarial valuation. Each member's contribution rate is fixed by statute and may vary for different group classifications

within a retirement system. For FRS, MPERS, and SPRF a portion of the employer contribution rate is set by statute. Any excess required above the statutory limit is paid from the Insurance Premium Tax Fund (IPTF). Currently, the IPTF funds allocated to these three systems are more than sufficient to meet the combined excess employer contribution. Any excess IPTF allocations revert back to the state general fund.

Investment Income

Investment earnings include all income earned under the trust such as dividends, interest and capital gains or losses, and are essential to meet the long range projections under the actuarial funding method and assumptions.

Employer Funding for Pension Benefits - State Retirement Systems

General

The state of Louisiana is primarily responsible for funding the actuarial liabilities of the four state retirement systems - defined benefit plans - through general fund appropriations, either directly or as transfer payments to local school districts. The annual employer contribution includes the normal cost, amortization payment on unfunded accrued liability (UAL), and a state appropriation for the LSU Unfunded Plan under LASERS and TRSL. The UAL is that portion of the actuarial accrued liability not funded by the actuarial value of the system assets on a valuation date. If assets exceed the actuarial accrued liability then the system is fully funded with a positive credit balance. The normal cost is that portion equal to the year's expected additional accrual.

Guaranteed Payment

Our state constitution guarantees an annual employer payment for the four state systems sufficient to pay the normal cost and amortize the initial unfunded accrued liability (established as of June 30, 1988) by the year 2029; 2019 for State Police. If the legislature fails to provide this payment, the state treasurer must pay the required amount from the state general fund upon a warrant issued by the administrative authority

of the retirement system affected by the shortfall. The constitution requires that the systems' liabilities must be *funded on an actuarially sound basis*.

General Fund Payments

The state's portion of the employer contribution requirement for three of the state retirement systems - LASERS, TRSL, and STPOL - is directly funded from general fund appropriations. For FY 2000, the total estimated amount due from the general fund is \$474.3 million for these three systems.

State Employees

About 69% of the total required employer contribution is paid directly from general fund appropriations. The remaining 31% is paid from self-generated funds and from the federal government for federally funded programs.

Projected Employer Contributions (millions)		
Source	FY1999	FY2000
From General Fund	\$144*	\$150*
Other Sources	\$65	\$67
Total Required	\$209	\$217
Percent of Payroll	12.4%	12.3%

* An additional state appropriation of \$4.3 million for FY 1999 and \$4.5 million for FY 2000 is required to fund the LSU Unfunded Plan.

Teachers

About 69% of the total required employer contribution is paid directly from general fund appropriations. The remaining 31%, is paid from local school districts, self-generated funds, and from the federal government for federally funded programs.

Projected Employer Contributions (millions)		
Source	FY1999	FY2000
From General Fund	\$309*	\$295*
Other Sources	\$139	\$132
Total Required	\$448	\$427
Percent of Payroll	16.5%	15.2%

* An additional state appropriation of \$4.6 million for FY 1999 and \$4.8 million for FY 2000 is required to fund the LSU Unfunded Plan.

Teachers - ORP

In 1990, an optional retirement plan (ORP) was established for academic and unclassified employees of public institutions of higher education. This is a defined contribution plan that is administered by TRSL. The ORP participants are not members of TRSL and their benefits are not guaranteed by the state. Each employer contributes to TRSL the same amount it would have contributed if the ORP participant had been a member. The employer normal cost portion is credited to the participants account (ORP normal cost) while the remainder is retained by TRSL as a payment on the UAL. For fiscal year 1998 the total ORP normal cost payment credited towards participants' accounts was \$39.5 million while the ORP employer payment retained by TRSL to fund the UAL was \$27.3 million. ORP is directly funded by the state from general fund appropriations only on the portion of salary not paid by fees or other self-generated funds received by the institutions of higher learning.

State Police

The state contributes 100% of the employer contribution from general fund appropriations.

Projected Employer Contributions (millions)		
Source	FY1999	FY2000
From General Fund	\$20	\$20
Other Sources	\$0	\$0
Total Required	\$20	\$20
Percent of Payroll	66.0%	63.5%

School Employees

The employer contribution is paid from local school district funds. This system is fully funded and therefore the only annual employer cost is the normal cost requirement. LSERS actuarial value of assets exceeds the actuarial accrued liability balance by \$202.3 million as of June 30, 1998.

The actuarially determined employer contribution for fiscal year 1999 is \$9.8 million. However, by statute the required employer contribution is \$13.7 million (6.0% of projected payroll) which will generate a surplus contribution of \$3.9 million to an overfunded system. The statutorily required contribution for FY 2000 is projected to be \$14.1 million compared to the actuarially required amount of \$5.2.

Projected Employer Contributions (millions)		
Source	FY1999	FY2000
Actuarially Required	\$9.8	\$5.2
Percent of Payroll	4.3%	2.2%
Minimum Required	\$13.7	\$14.1
Percent of Payroll	6.0%	6.0%
Surplus	\$3.9	\$8.9

Texaco Settlement Fund

The Texaco Settlement Fund evolved from a litigation settlement with Texaco. Under the terms of settlement, Texaco agreed to pay the proceeds to the state over a three-year period, commencing on February 28, 1994.

Based on a recommendation adopted by the Bond Commission, the settlement was paid to the three state retirement systems - LASERS, TRSL and STPOL - to assist in funding their initial unfunded accrued liabilities (IUAL). The allocated funds are treated as a separate account under each system's trust and credited with the actuarial rate of return for the year. When the account accumulates to the outstanding balance of the IUAL it will liquidate the liability.

Based on valuation interest rate assumptions, we project that the accumulated value of Texaco Settlement Funds will liquidate the IUAL by the year 2027 for LASERS and TRSL and by the year 2008 for STPOL. An additional allocation of \$19.4 million was granted to the STPOL fund, under ACT 471 of the 1997 Regular Session, to accelerate payoff of the

UAL. We project that this supplement will complete the IUAL funding for this system three years sooner, by the year 2005.

Accumulating the Texaco funds will save the state substantial UAL payments that would otherwise be required until the year 2029.

TEXACO FUND BALANCES

(as of 6/30/98)

(millions)

System	Accumulated Proceeds	Accumulated Interest	Balance
LASERS	\$64.3	\$31.4	\$95.7
TRSL	\$135.5	\$81.0	\$216.5
STPOL	\$24.7	\$6.1	\$30.8
Combined	\$224.6	\$118.5	\$343.1

UAL Balance

As of June 30, 1998, the total net UAL balance (reduced by Texaco Settlement Funds) for the three unfunded state systems - LASERS, TRSL, and STPOL - is \$6.1 billion:

UAL BALANCES

(as of 6/30/98)

(millions)

System	Valuation UAL (Funding)	Texaco Funds	Net UAL (Reduced by Texaco Funds)
LASERS	\$1,981.0	\$95.7	\$1,885.3
TRSL	\$4,329.9	\$216.5	\$4,113.4
STPOL	\$155.1	\$30.8	\$124.2
Combined	\$6,466.0	\$343.1	\$6,123.0

The total general fund expenditure estimated to fund the \$6.5 billion valuation UAL for fiscal year 1999 is \$287.2 million (states portion of total \$404.7 million UAL amortization payment). This represents about 60% of the \$482.2 million in total general fund expenditures required to actuarially fund the three unfunded state systems (states portion of total \$685.8 million total contribution required for FY 1999).

Employer Funding for Pension Benefits - Statewide Retirement Systems

General

Employer contributions required to fund the actuarial liabilities for the nine statewide retirement systems - defined benefit plans - come from the sources listed in items 1 through 5 below. For example, the employer contribution for statewide system ASSR comes from local appropriations, ad valorem taxes, and general revenue sharing funds as listed under items 1 through 3 below.

Sources of Employer Contribution

System	Local 1	Ad Valorem 2	Revenue Sharing 3	IPTF 4	State General Fund 5
ASSR	x	x	x		
CCRS	x	x	x		
DARS		x	x		x
FRS	x			x	
MERS	x	x	x		
MPERS	x			x	
PERS	x	x	x		
RVRS	x	x	x		
SPRF	x	x	x	x	

1. Local appropriations from municipalities or parishes as a percent of member payroll
2. Percent of ad valorem taxes collectible by the rolls of each parish according to statute
3. General revenue sharing funds
4. Insurance premium tax funds
5. State general fund appropriations

Projected Employer Contributions

The projected employer contributions for FY 1999 for the nine statewide systems are shown in the following section of the report titled: **Employer Funding for Pension Benefits - Contribution Sources** (page 17).

UAL Balances

Under the state constitution, funding requirements for the nine statewide systems are actuarially determined. As for state systems, the annual employer contribution consists of a normal cost payment and (for those

systems that generate a UAL under the actuarial funding method) an amortization payment to fund the UAL. **As of their 1998 fiscal year end, six of the statewide unfunded systems had a combined UAL balance of \$457 million:**

System	UAL Balance (millions)
ASSR	\$34.0
CCRS	\$77.4
FRS	\$55.0
MERS	\$70.0
PERS*	\$135.5
SPRF	\$85.1

* (Plan A) ('97)

The statewide system MPERS is fully funded as of June 30, 1998 since the actuarial value of assets exceeds the actuarial accrued liability balance by \$68.2 million. This surplus balance is net of the \$14.0 million of additional liability added last year for new cost-of-living benefits granted to retirees.

Aggregate Funding

Some of the statewide systems such as DARS, PERS (Plan B), and RVRS employ an actuarial funding method that makes no reference at all to an actuarial accrued liability for prior service (Aggregate Funding Method). Therefore, there is no UAL generated under this actuarial funding technique. For these systems, all employer costs are determined as future normal cost payments.

Benefit Formulas and Employee Contributions

Retirement Eligibility

All thirteen state and statewide systems provide some combination of years of service and age in order to qualify for full retirement benefits. Some of the systems provide for early retirement benefit based on actuarial reduction for the earlier benefit payout. Vested benefits, pre-retirement survivor death benefits, disability benefits, DROP benefits, and cost-of-living adjustments are also included in the overall benefit package of each system and are payable upon

meeting established eligibility and statutory requirements.

Benefit Formulas

Louisiana's state and statewide systems provide retirement benefits that are based on a member's years of service, age at retirement, and final average compensation. They are commonly referred to as "defined benefit" plans.

Formula benefits accrue at a specific rate for each year of service. Final average compensation is based on the actual compensation received for the three (3) highest successive years before retirement. Benefits based on final average compensation are designed to provide reasonable pre-retirement income replacement for long service employees. Shorter service employees receive proportionally lower replacement benefits.

Social Security

With the exception of two statewide plans – MERS (B) and PERS (B) – Social Security coverage is not provided to members during their years of participation in the other state and statewide retirement systems. The current accrual rates for the non-covered social Security Systems range from 2.0% to 3.5% for each year of service.

Employee Contributions

All of the state and statewide systems require employee contributions as part of the overall funding requirement to pay for the proposed retirement benefits. The contribution rates are set by statute. They currently range from 2.0% to 11.5% of pay.

Replacement Ratios

The replacement ratios included in the report show the amount of normal retirement benefit as a percent of pre-retirement salary for the thirteen retirement systems based on years of service accumulated at retirement for a new member. Because of the different nature of the plans covering law enforcement officers and firefighters, and all other employee groups, the re-placement ratios are shown at age 65 for the latter group.

Based on current benefit provision and salary increase assumptions, our calculations show that re-placement ratios vary for the non-Social Security plans from: (a) 70% to 81% for law enforcement officers and firefighters at age 55 with 25 years of service, and (b) 71% to 96% for other employee groups at age 65 with 30 years of service.

Actuarial Concerns / Funding Issues

Pension Problems

In this section of the report we address some of the pension problems dealing with benefit issues and funding alternatives. Addressing pension problems in advance makes good business sense for the state by giving legislators ample time to take corrective steps to assure that our retirement systems are actuarially sound. We have focused on the two largest systems, LASERS and TRSL. These two systems have the largest unfunded liabilities and represent about 73% of a total membership of 321,300 active and inactive members for the combined thirteen state and statewide retirement systems. Actuarial concerns are highlighted in order to give legislators a “quick reading” of pension issues that may require further attention.

***EMPLOYER
FUNDING
FOR
PENSION
BENEFITS***

1. Funding Methods

Funding Method

Although the level of employee contribution rate is fixed by statute, the annual employer contribution rate needed to support the benefits is determined by the retirement system's actuary. This determination is accomplished by performing an annual actuarial valuation that calculates the total projected actuarial liability of the expected benefit payouts of each retirement system. The actuarial cost method allocates the computed actuarial liability between future normal cost payments and future amortization payments on unfunded accrued liability (if any). All actuarial funding methods target to have contribution plus trust earnings accumulate to meet ultimate expected benefits and plan expenses.

State Systems:

System	Funding Method	Creates UAL
LASERS	Projected Unit Credit	yes
TRSL	Projected Unit Credit	yes
STPOL	Entry Age Normal	yes
LSERS	Entry Age Normal	yes

Statewide Systems:

System	Funding Method	Creates UAL
ASSR	Frozen Attained Age Normal	IUAL only
CCRS	Frozen Attained Age Normal	IUAL only
DARS	Aggregate	no
FRS	Entry Age Normal	yes
MERSA	Frozen Attained Age Normal	IUAL only
MERSB	Frozen Attained Age Normal	IUAL only
MPERS	Entry Age Normal	yes
PERSA	Frozen Attained Age Normal	IUAL only
PERSB	Aggregate	no
RVRS	Aggregate	no
SPRF	Frozen Attained Age Normal	IUAL only

Normal Cost

The total **Normal Cost** is that portion of the projected actuarial liability for benefits and expenses allocated to a valuation year by the applicable actuarial cost method. The portion of the total normal cost not

funded by member contributions becomes the employer normal cost portion for the valuation year.

Accrued Liability

The portions of the total computed actuarial liabilities not funded as future normal cost payments is the **Actuarial Accrued Liability**. Under certain actuarial cost methods it is the liability for benefit service already completed by the current valuation population consisting of former active members and members that are currently active.

UAL

The **Unfunded Accrued Liability (UAL)** is that portion of the actuarial accrued liability that is not funded by the system's **Valuation Assets** on the valuation date. Normally, as of each valuation date, it consists of the unamortized value of the initial unfunded accrued liability and the unamortized values of supplemental accrued liabilities that may be generated each year. These supplemental liabilities originate through actuarial gains and losses, changes in actuarial assumptions or funding methods along with any changes in benefit structures. Under some actuarial cost methods, supplemental accrued liabilities may be funded as future normal cost payments.

2. Employer Contribution Rates

Contribution Rates

The employer contribution rates are shown as a percent of payroll. In addition, various retirement systems also require supplemental appropriations from the state, ad valorem taxes, revenue sharing funds, and payments from the Insurance Premium Tax Fund (IPTF). The following contribution rates were adopted by PRSAC (Public Retirement Systems' Actuarial Committee).

Contribution Rates

State Systems

Fiscal Year 1999

System	Actuarially Required	Projected Rate	LSU Unfunded
LASERS	12.4%	12.4%	\$4,298,757
TRSL	15.5%	16.5%	\$4,639,833
STPOL	61.7%	66.0%	n/a
SCHEMP	2.2%	6.0%	n/a

Fiscal Year 2000

System	Actuarially Required*	Projected Rate	LSU Unfunded
LASERS	n/a	12.3%	\$4,492,201
TRSL	n/a	15.2%	\$4,848,626
STPOL	n/a	63.5%	n/a
SCHEMP	n/a	6.0%	n/a

* The Actuarially Required Rates for Fiscal Year 2000 will be available after the June 30, 1999 Actuarial Valuations are finished.

Ad Valorem Taxes

Ad valorem tax rates shown are a percentage of the aggregate taxes shown to be collectible by the tax rolls of each parish. For some systems, different percentages apply to Orleans Parish. Parochial Employees' Retirement System excludes Orleans and East Baton Rouge Parishes from the tax rolls.

Rates for Local Appropriations (Percent of Payroll)

Statewide Systems

Fiscal Year 1999		
System	Actuarially Required	Projected Rate
ASSR	2.10%	3.25%
CCRS	6.69%	7.75%
DARS	0.00%	0.00%
FRS	9.00%	9.00%
MERSA	4.92%	5.75%
MERSB	4.31%	3.75%
MPERS	7.80%	9.00%
PERSA	4.20%	5.50%
PERSB	1.68%	2.50%
RVRS	0.00%	0.00%
SPRF	5.01%	5.00%

Rate for Total Public Funds (Percent of Payroll)*

Fiscal Year 2000				
System	IPTF for FY 1999	Local Projected Rate	Ad Valorem	Revenue Sharing
ASSR	n/a	2.00%	0.25%	Max
CCRS	n/a	7.00%	0.25%	Max
DARS	n/a	0.00%	0.1367%	Max
FRS ⁽¹⁾	\$9,020,723	9.00%	n/a	n/a
MERSA	n/a	4.75%	0.25%	Max
MERSB	n/a	4.50%	0.25%	Max
MPERS ⁽¹⁾	\$0	9.00%	n/a	n/a
PERSA ⁽²⁾	n/a	4.25%	0.25%	Max
PERSB ⁽²⁾	n/a	1.50%	0.25%	Max
RVRS ⁽³⁾	n/a	0.00%	0.0266%	Max
SPRF	\$0	5.00%	0.50%	Max
<p>(1) For FY 1998 IPTF paid additional \$9,648,122 for Firefighters and \$3,041,136 for MPERS.</p> <p>(2) Parochial values are from the 12/31/97 report - FY 1998 Actual and FY 1999 Projected.</p> <p>(3) The Ad Valorem Tax for Registrars of Voters includes the Defined Contribution allocation.</p> <p>* Applies only to Local Projected Rate.</p>				

3. Contribution Sources

State Systems

The State of Louisiana is primarily responsible for funding the actuarial liabilities of the four state retirement systems - defined benefit plans - through general fund appropriations or as transfer payments to local school districts.

Projected Employer Contribution for FY 1999 (\$millions)

State Employees

Source	Normal Cost	UAL Payment	Total	LSU Unfunded
General Fund	\$67.2	\$76.9	\$144.1	\$4.3
Other Sources	\$30.2	\$34.5	\$64.7	\$0
Total	\$97.4	\$111.4	\$208.8	\$4.3
General Fund as % of Total	69.0%	69.0%	69.0%	100.0%

Teachers

Source	Normal Cost	UAL Payment	Total	LSU Unfunded
General Fund	\$124.5	\$184.9	\$309.4	\$4.6
Other Sources	\$55.9	\$83.0	\$138.9	\$0
Total	\$180.4	\$267.9	\$448.3	\$4.6
General Fund as % of Total	69.0%	69.0%	69.0%	100.0%

State Police

Source	Normal Cost	UAL Payment	Total	LSU Unfunded
General Fund	\$3.3	\$16.5	\$19.8	\$0
Other Sources	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total	\$3.3	\$16.5	\$19.8	\$0
General Fund as % of Total	100%	100%	100%	0.0%

Combined State Unfunded Systems

Source	Normal Cost	UAL Payment	Total	LSU Unfunded
General Fund	\$195.0	\$278.3	\$473.3	\$8.9
Other Sources	\$86.1	\$117.5	\$203.6	\$0
Total	\$281.1	\$395.8	\$676.9	\$8.9
General Fund as % of Total	69.3%	70.3%	69.9%	100.0%

School Employees

Source	Normal Cost	UAL Payment	Total	Additional Under Statute
Local School Districts	\$15.3	(\$5.6)	\$9.7	\$3.9

Statewide Systems

The following tables list the funding sources for the eleven statewide retirement systems. Total public funding includes local appropriations, ad valorem taxes, general revenue sharing funds, and insurance premium tax funds. The limit on local appropriations is set by statute at 9% of payroll for Firefighters and Municipal Police Systems and 6% of payroll for the Sheriffs' System. Employee contributions are not included in the amounts shown below.

Projected Employer Contributions FY 1999
(\$millions)

Assessors

Source	\$Amount	%Payroll
Local Appropriations	\$0.8	3.25%
Ad Valorem Taxes	\$3.5	15.31%
Revenue Sharing	\$0.4	1.53%
IPTF	\$0.0	0.00%
Total Public Funds	\$4.6	20.08%

Clerks

Source	\$Amount	%Payroll
Local Appropriations	\$4.2	7.75%
Ad Valorem Taxes	\$3.5	6.58%
Revenue Sharing	\$0.3	0.60%
IPTF	\$0.0	0.00%
Total Public Funds	\$8.0	14.93%

District Attorneys

Source	\$Amount	%Payroll
Local Appropriations	\$0.0	0.00%
Ad Valorem Taxes	\$1.8	6.00%
Revenue Sharing	\$0.2	0.57%
IPTF	\$0.0	0.00%
Total Public Funds	\$2.0	6.57%

Firefighters

Source	\$Amount	%Payroll
Local Appropriations	\$7.5	9.00%
Ad Valorem Taxes	\$0.0	0.00%
Revenue Sharing	\$0.0	0.00%
IPTF	\$9.0	10.76%
Total Public Funds	\$16.6	19.76%

***Municipal Employees
Plan A***

Source	\$Amount	%Payroll
Local Appropriations	\$7.0	5.75%
Ad Valorem Taxes	\$2.4	1.98%
Revenue Sharing	\$0.1	0.10%
IPTF	\$0.0	0.00%
Total Public Funds	\$9.5	7.83%

Projected Employer Contributions FY 1999
(\$millions)

***Municipal Employees
Plan B***

Source	\$Amount	%Payroll
Local Appropriations	\$1.5	3.75%
Ad Valorem Taxes	\$0.8	1.94%
Revenue Sharing	\$0.0	0.10%
IPTF	\$0.0	0.00%
Total Public Funds	\$2.3	5.78%

Municipal Police

Source	\$Amount	%Payroll
Local Appropriations	\$12.0	9.00%
Ad Valorem Taxes	\$0.0	0.00%
Revenue Sharing	\$0.0	0.00%
IPTF	\$0.0	0.00%
Total Public Funds	\$12.0	9.00%

***Parochial Employees
Plan A***

Source	\$Amount	%Payroll
Local Appropriations	\$16.6	5.50%
Ad Valorem Taxes	\$3.0	0.98%
Revenue Sharing	\$0.0	0.00%
IPTF	\$0.0	0.00%
Total Public Funds	\$19.6	6.48%

***Parochial Employees
Plan B***

Source	\$Amount	%Payroll
Local Appropriations	\$0.9	2.50%
Ad Valorem Taxes	\$0.3	0.98%
Revenue Sharing	\$0.0	0.00%
IPTF	\$0.0	0.00%
Total Public Funds	\$1.2	3.48%

Registrars

Source	\$Amount	%Payroll
Local Appropriations	\$0.0	0.00%
Ad Valorem Taxes	\$0.2	4.62%
Revenue Sharing	\$0.1	1.77%
IPTF	\$0.0	0.00%
Total Public Funds	\$0.3	6.39%

Sheriffs

Source	\$Amount	%Payroll
Local Appropriations	\$13.8	5.00%
Ad Valorem Taxes	\$7.1	2.55%
Revenue Sharing	\$0.4	0.15%
IPTF	\$0.0	0.00%
Total Public Funds	\$21.3	7.70%

4. Contribution History

Employer Contribution History (\$millions)

State Employees

Component	FY2000	FY1999	FY1998	FY1997	FY1996
Normal Cost	\$105.5	\$97.4	\$91.7	\$91.2	\$85.6
UAL Payment	\$111.4	\$111.4	\$120.8	\$108.3	\$106.5
Total	\$216.9	\$208.8	\$212.5	\$199.5	\$192.1
Percent of Payroll	12.3%	12.4%	13.0%	12.4%	12.0%
Payroll	\$1,760.3	\$1,680.5	\$1,633.5	\$1,610.2	\$1,598.4
LSU Unfunded Pmt	\$4.5	\$4.3	\$4.1	\$3.9	\$3.8

Teachers

Component	FY2000	FY1999	FY1998	FY1997	FY1996
Normal Cost	\$183.5	\$180.4	\$169.4	\$162.0	\$160.9
UAL Payment	\$243.3	\$267.9	\$251.7	\$243.2	\$236.1
Total	\$426.8	\$448.3	\$421.1	\$405.2	\$397.1
Percent of Payroll	15.2%	16.5%	16.4%	16.5%	16.5%
Payroll	\$2,649.3	\$2,566.7	\$2,414.1	\$2,328.3	\$2,270.1
LSU Unfunded Pmt	\$4.8	\$4.6	\$4.4	\$4.2	\$4.1

State Police

Component	FY2000	FY1999	FY1998	FY1997	FY1996
Normal Cost	\$3.3	\$3.3	\$3.0	\$2.6	\$2.4
UAL Payment	\$16.4	\$16.5	\$17.1	\$16.0	\$19.3
Total	\$19.7	\$19.8	\$20.1	\$18.6	\$21.7
Percent of Payroll	63.5%	66.0%	71.6%	74.5%	94.7%
Payroll	\$31.0	\$30.0	\$28.1	\$24.9	\$22.9

Minimum Required Contribution

The employee rate for School Employees is 6.0% of pay. The constitution prohibits the employer rate from being lower than the employee rate once the system becomes fully funded. Hence, the employer is required to fund at 6.0% of payroll even though the plan is overfunded.

(\$millions)

School Employees

Component	FY2000	FY1999	FY1998	FY1997	FY1996
Normal Cost	\$15.7	\$15.3	\$14.8	\$14.5	\$14.2
UAL Payment	\$(10.5)	\$(5.6)	\$(5.1)	\$(3.5)	\$(3.6)
Total	\$5.2	\$9.7	\$9.7	\$10.7	\$10.6
Percent of Payroll	2.2%	4.3%	4.4%	5.0%	5.1%
Payroll	\$234.2	\$227.8	\$221.3	\$213.1	\$209.3
Minimum Required	\$14.0	\$13.7	\$13.3	\$12.8	\$12.6
Percent of Payroll	6.0%	6.0%	6.0%	6.0%	6.0%

5. Funding Measure Under GASB

Funding Progress

Under Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB), public retirement systems show the development of funding progress by including the ratio of unfunded actuarial accrued liabilities (UAAL) to the valuation payroll as of the valuation date. Such ratios over time indicate whether or not the system is becoming financially stronger. Usually, the smaller the ratio, the stronger the system is financially.

Inflation Adjusted

The dollar amount value of UAL that is developed can be misleading when analyzing the funded status of a retirement system. That is because the impact of inflation may cause the values of employee pay, retirement benefits, and the UAL to increase in dollar amount, even though the real value of some or all of these items may be decreasing. Therefore, UAAL divided by valuation payroll provides a funding index adjusted for inflation which shows the real progress made in accumulating assets to pay for benefits when due.

No values are developed for those statewide systems that utilize the Aggregate Funding Method. As mentioned earlier, this funding method does not generate unfunded actuarial accrued liabilities.

UAAL as a Percent of Valuation Payroll

State Systems

System	FY1996	FY1997	FY1998
LASERS	135.1%	121.5%	114.0%
TRSL	185.3%	185.0%	165.5%
STPOL	652.9%	496.7%	419.1%
LSERS	(45.4)%	(48.4)%	(89.6)%

**UAAL as a Percent
of Valuation Payroll**

Statewide Systems

System	FY1996	FY1997	FY1998
ASSR	168.3%	157.6%	152.3%
CCRS	154.6%	153.9%	149.0%
DARS	n/a	n/a	n/a
FRS	87.2%	86.0%	69.4%
MERSA	52.6%	52.3%	53.2%
MERSB	24.5%	22.4%	21.0%
MPERS	(25.9)%	(14.7)%	(38.0)%
PERSA	48.1%	46.5%	incomplete
PERSB	n/a	n/a	n/a
RVRS	n/a	n/a	n/a
SPRF	42.0%	38.5%	32.8%

6. Funded Ratios as of June 30, 1998

Funded Ratios

Measuring assets against liabilities can vary depending upon purpose. To determine the system's funding progress, all actuarial assets available for plan benefits (includes Texaco and Experience Accounts) are measured against the actuarial liability of projected accrued benefits (PBO). In regards to COLAs, for an "Actual Funded Ratio" the state systems and Municipal Police compare Valuation Assets (excludes Texaco and Experience Accounts) to the accrued liability under the funding method, and all other statewide systems compare Actuarial Value of Assets to PBO. The ratio is then compared to the formula Target Ratio. Under current statutes, if the Target Ratio is less than the Funded Ratio, the retirement system can grant COLA benefits.

The PBO is a measure of accrued benefits and is independent of any actuarial cost method. However, the values produced follow the actuarial accrued liability calculated under the projected unit credit cost method. The ratio of actuarial value of assets to PBO produces the funded ratio, whereas the PBO by itself is not a measure of funded status.

Funding Progress (\$millions)

State Systems

System	Actuarial Value of Assets	PBO	Funded Ratio
LASERS	\$5,322.9	\$6,953.1	76.6%
TRSL	\$9,852.0	\$13,185.2	74.7%
STPOL	\$188.9	\$313.1	60.3%
LSERS	\$1,344.6	\$1,062.7	126.5%
State Total	\$16,708.3	\$21,514.1	77.7%

Funding Progress (\$millions)

Statewide Systems

System	Actuarial Value of Assets	PBO	Funded Ratio
ASSR *	\$92.0	\$121.5	75.7%
CCRS	\$143.1	\$204.1	70.1%
DARS	\$112.5	\$87.4	128.8%
FRS	\$519.9	\$551.3	94.3%
MERSA	\$370.2	\$392.3	94.3%
MERSB	\$79.4	\$82.5	96.3%
MPERS	\$1,018.4	\$905.2	112.5%
PERSA **	\$874.0	\$882.0	99.1%
PERSB **	\$60.7	\$45.9	132.1%
RVRS	\$38.8	\$33.0	117.7%
SPRF	\$608.9	\$620.5	98.1%
Statewide Total	\$3,918.0	\$3,925.7	99.8%

* The values for Assessors' System are based on the actuarial valuation as of September 30, 1998.

** The values for Parochial System are based on the most recent actuarial valuation as of December 31, 1997.

Funding Progress (\$millions)

Combined Systems

System	Actuarial Value of Assets	PBO	Funded Ratio
Total	\$20,626.3	\$25,439.8	81.1%

Funding Eligibility for COLAs (\$millions)

State Systems

System	Target Ratio	Actual Funded Ratio
LASERS	74.2%	71.5%
TRSL	69.4%	67.2%
STPOL	43.4%	50.5%
LSERS	100.0%	118.0%

Funding Eligibility for COLAs
(\$millions)

Statewide Systems

System	Target Ratio	Actual Funded Ratio
ASSR *	68.4%	75.7%
CCRS	55.6%	70.1%
DARS	87.6%	128.8%
FRS	73.8%	94.3%
MERSA	72.8%	94.3%
MERSB	69.0%	96.3%
MPERS	100.0%	107.2%
PERSA **	70.9%	99.1%
PERSB **	100.0%	132.1%
RVRS	90.9%	117.7%
SPRF	70.6%	98.1%

* The values for Assessors' System are based on the actuarial valuation as of September 30, 1998.

** The values for Parochial System are based on the most recent actuarial valuation as of December 31, 1997.

7. UAL Balances

Valuation Balances

Unfunded Accrued Liability (UAL) values are dependent on the particular funding method selected for the system. Certain funding methods do not have a UAL base to amortize. These methods spread all future costs over the participants working lifetime. UAL bases are amortized over a number of years specified in statutes. The valuation UAL balance for State Employees, Teachers and State Police Systems excludes assets allocated to the Texaco Settlement Account and Experience Account (not applicable to State Police).

Valuation UAL Balance (\$millions)

State Systems

System	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998
LASERS	\$2,213.6	\$2,036.2	\$1,981.0
TRSL	\$4,336.5	\$4,504.3	\$4,329.9
STPOL	\$166.5	\$164.4	\$155.1
LSERS	-\$95.9	-\$106.2	-\$202.3
Total	\$6,620.7	\$6,598.7	\$6,263.7

Statewide Systems

System	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998
ASSR	\$32.7	\$33.4	\$34.0
CCRS	\$73.2	\$75.3	\$77.4
DARS	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
FRS	\$59.6	\$62.6	\$55.0
MERSA	\$59.0	\$60.5	\$62.0
MERSB	\$8.4	\$8.2	\$8.0
MPERS	-\$27.2	-\$18.2	-\$68.2
PERSA	\$129.2	\$132.4	\$135.5
PERSB	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
RVRS	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
SPRF	\$81.8	\$83.5	\$85.1
Total	\$416.7	\$437.7	\$388.8

All Systems Combined

System	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998
Total For All Systems:	\$7,037.4	\$7,036.4	\$6,652.6

Financial UAL Balance

The financial UAL balance is equal to the valuation UAL balance adjusted for Texaco Settlement funds. The balances shown below for the three systems are adjusted by the suspense accounts set up to hold the monies received from the Texaco Settlement. The School Employees' system is included below so that the State Total can be compared to the previous table in the Valuation Balances section.

Financial UAL Balance
(\$millions)

State Systems

System	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998
LASERS	\$2,139.9	\$1,951.4	\$1,885.3
TRSL	\$4,177.6	\$4,325.1	\$4,113.4
STPOL	\$160.4	\$138.0	\$124.2
LSERS	-\$95.9	-\$106.2	-\$202.3
Total	\$6,382.1	\$6,308.3	\$5,920.7

8. Texaco Settlement

Texaco Settlement Fund

Under Act 4 of the 1994 R.S., the three state systems began receiving funds from the Texaco Settlement as state aid to accelerate the payoff of the unfunded accrued liability. These funds are held in a suspense account and are not used as an offset to the regular employee UAL amortization payments under Act 257 of the 1992 R.S. The settlement funds are credited with the respective actuarial rate of return earned by each system

Once the accumulated value of the account balance equals the outstanding balance of the initial unfunded accrued liability for each system, the account and initial liability will be liquidated

Texaco Fund Summary (millions)

State Employees

Fiscal Year	Allocation	Interest	Balance
1993	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
1994	\$36.0	\$0.0	\$36.0
1995	\$13.8	\$3.4	\$53.2
1996	\$13.8	\$6.6	\$73.6
1997	\$0.7	\$10.4	\$84.7
1998	\$0.0	\$11.0	\$95.7
TOTAL	\$64.3	\$31.4	\$95.7

Teachers

Fiscal Year	Allocation	Interest	Balance
1993	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
1994	\$77.2	\$0.0	\$77.2
1995	\$29.2	\$4.4	\$110.8
1996	\$29.2	\$18.9	\$158.9
1997	\$0.0	\$20.4	\$179.3
1998	\$0.0	\$37.2	\$216.5
TOTAL	\$135.5	\$81.0	\$216.5

Texaco Fund Summary
(millions)

State Police

Fiscal Year	Allocation	Interest	Balance
1993	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
1994	\$3.1	\$0.0	\$3.1
1995	\$1.2	\$0.2	\$4.5
1996	\$1.2	\$0.5	\$6.1
1997	\$19.4	\$0.9	\$26.4
1998	\$0.0	\$4.4	\$30.8
TOTAL	\$24.7	\$6.1	\$30.8

Combined

Fiscal Year	Allocation	Interest	Balance
1993	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
1994	\$116.2	\$0.0	\$116.2
1995	\$44.1	\$8.1	\$168.5
1996	\$44.1	\$26.0	\$238.6
1997	\$20.0	\$31.7	\$290.4
1998	\$0.0	\$52.7	\$343.1
TOTAL	\$224.6	\$118.5	\$343.1

9. Experience Account Summary

Establishment

The 1992 Regular Session established an Experience Account (EA) for LASERS and TRSL to provide funding for cost-of-living (COLA) benefits for current and future retirees. Each year the EA is credited or debited with 50% of the net investment experience gain or loss together with interest on the beginning account balance

Before the EA was enacted, the full investment gain or loss, amortized over a period of years was used to adjust the employer contribution amount for the upcoming fiscal year.

EA Operation

The EA balance is created by diverting trust assets from the funding process. Those assets are then returned when COLA benefits are approved. Although the EA balance may represent an amount of funds sufficient to cover the expected value of COLA benefits, it does not in itself provide the actual finding necessary to ultimately pay for COLA liabilities. Rather, funding for COLAs requires additional contributions from the state.

Experience Account History (\$millions)

State Employees

Fiscal Year	Allocation	Interest	Disburse	Balance	Impact on UAL
1992	\$27.3	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$27.3	\$27.3
1993	(\$2.8)	\$2.2	\$0.0	\$26.7	\$26.7
1994	\$8.5	\$2.4	\$0.0	\$37.6	\$37.6
1995	\$20.6	\$3.6	\$0.0	\$61.8	\$61.8
1996	\$73.8	\$7.6	\$58.4	\$84.8	\$143.2
1997	\$116.2	\$11.9	\$0.0	\$212.9	\$271.4
1998	\$104.6	\$27.6	\$90.0	\$255.1	\$403.5
TOTAL	\$348.3	\$55.3	\$148.5	\$255.1	\$403.5

Experience Account History
(\$millions)

Teachers

Fiscal Year	Allocation	Interest	Disburse	Balance	Impact on UAL
1992	\$33.4	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$33.4	\$33.4
1993	\$97.6	\$4.2	\$0.0	\$135.2	\$135.2
1994	\$24.5	\$12.4	\$0.0	\$172.1	\$172.1
1995	(\$73.4)	\$9.8	\$129.4	(\$20.9)	\$108.5
1996	\$271.5	(\$3.6)	\$0.0	\$247.0	\$376.5
1997	\$157.1	\$31.7	\$0.0	\$435.8	\$565.2
1998	\$473.3	\$90.5	\$219.4	\$780.3	\$1,129.1
TOTAL	\$984.0	\$145.1	\$348.8	\$780.3	\$1,129.1

Combined

Fiscal Year	Allocation	Interest	Disburse	Balance	Impact on UAL
1992	\$60.7	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$60.7	\$60.7
1993	\$94.9	\$6.4	\$0.0	\$161.9	\$161.9
1994	\$33.1	\$14.8	\$0.0	\$209.8	\$209.8
1995	(\$52.9)	\$13.4	\$129.4	\$40.9	\$170.3
1996	\$345.3	\$4.1	\$58.4	\$331.9	\$519.7
1997	\$273.3	\$43.6	\$0.0	\$648.8	\$836.6
1998	\$577.8	\$118.2	\$309.4	\$1,035.3	\$1,532.6
TOTAL	\$1,332.2	\$200.4	\$497.3	\$1,035.3	\$1,532.6

10. Insurance Premium Tax Fund (IPTF) - Assessments

Statewide Systems

The Commission deposits 0.7% (0.007) of the Net Premiums with the state treasurer for the exclusive use of the three statewide retirement systems: Municipal Police, Firefighters, and Sheriffs. Net Premiums are the gross direct premiums received in the state, in the preceding year, from insurers doing business in Louisiana and subject to this Part, less returned premiums.

Funds are first applied to the remaining portion of the actuarially required contributions. Second, the assessment shall be used for funding of mergers. The aggregate of all mergers being funded in one year cannot exceed 25% of the total year's assessment.

Mergers are funded over a 30-year period, unless a shorter period is approved by PRSAC. A shorter period is limited to 5% of the total assessment in any one-year.

Available Funds (\$millions)

Written Premium Basis	For Calendar Year	Net Premium	Assessment for Deposit	Merger Limit
1990	1991	\$3,301.8	\$23.1	\$5.8
1991	1992	\$3,399.3	\$23.8	\$5.9
1992	1993	\$3,470.8	\$24.3	\$6.1
1993	1994	\$3,452.4	\$24.2	\$6.0
1994	1995	\$3,897.2	\$27.3	\$6.8
1995	1996	\$4,235.4	\$29.6	\$7.4
1996	1997	\$4,158.0	\$29.1	\$7.3
1997	1998	\$4,298.5	\$30.1	\$7.5

The remaining portion shown below is the amount left after receipt of employee and employer contributions and all dedicated funds and taxes and is returned to the state general fund.

Allocated IPTF Funds
(\$millions)

Calendar Year	Plan Year	Actual Deposit	Retirement Committee Allocation	Remainder to General Fund
1993	1994	\$23.2	\$8.1	\$15.1
1994	1995	\$24.0	\$10.8	\$13.2
1995	1996	\$23.7	\$13.5	\$10.2
1996	1997	\$28.0	\$10.5	\$17.6
1997	1998	\$29.1	\$12.7	\$16.3
1998	1999	\$30.1	\$9.0*	\$21.1

* For Firefighters' Retirement System

11. Asset Balances as of June 30, 1998

Assets

Assets held in retirement trusts are built from contributions and earnings thereon. Market Value (fair value) of assets is required for GASB financial requirements including asset/liability and income/expense statements. Actuarial Value of Assets is applied for valuation purposes in all thirteen state and statewide systems to smooth market value gains and losses.

Certain state plans use the term Valuation Assets when the actuarial value is reduced for special accounts (Experience Account, Texaco Funds, LSU AG). The Actuarial Value of Assets or netted Valuation Assets are used to determine annual contributions and COLA Target Funding tests.

Asset Values (\$millions)

State Systems

System	Market Value (Fair Value) of Assets	Actuarial Value of Assets	Valuation Assets
LASERS	\$5,608.5	\$5,322.9	\$4,972.1
TRSL	\$10,443.9	\$9,852.0	\$8,855.2
STPOL	\$209.7	\$188.9	\$158.1
LSERS	\$1,446.1	\$1,344.6	\$1,344.6
State Total	\$17,708.3	\$16,708.3	\$15,329.9
Percent of Market Value	100.0%	94.4%	86.6%

Asset Values
(\$millions)

Statewide Systems

System	Market Value (Fair Value) of Assets	Actuarial Value of Assets	Valuation Assets
ASSR *	\$96.1	\$92.0	\$92.0
CCRS	\$163.5	\$143.1	\$143.1
DARS	\$127.7	\$112.5	\$112.5
FRS	\$536.8	\$519.9	\$519.9
MERSA	\$408.7	\$370.2	\$370.2
MERSB	\$87.6	\$79.4	\$79.4
MPERS	\$1,073.2	\$1,018.4	\$1,018.4
PERSA **	\$984.1	\$874.0	\$874.0
PERSB **	\$67.9	\$60.7	\$60.7
RVRS	\$42.1	\$38.8	\$38.8
SPRF	\$658.6	\$608.9	\$608.9
Statewide Total	\$4,246.3	\$3,918.0	\$3,918.0
Percent of Market Value	100.0%	92.3%	92.3%

* The values for Assessors' System are based on the actuarial valuation as of September 30, 1998.

** The values for Parochial System are based on the most recent actuarial valuation as of December 31, 1997.

Combined Total

System	Market Value (Fair Value) of Assets	Actuarial Value of Assets	Valuation Assets
Total For All Systems:	\$21,954.5	\$20,626.3	\$19,247.9
Percent of Market Value:	100.0%	94.0%	87.7%

12. Investment Returns

Annual Rate of Return

State Systems:

System	FY98		FY97		Expected Long Term
	Market Value	Actuarial Value of Assets	Market Value	Actuarial Value of Assets	
LASERS	12.06%	12.97%	16.92%	14.03%	8.25%
TRSL	18.10%	20.78%	16.26%	12.82%	8.25%
STPOL	15.93%	16.84%	20.15%	14.86%	7.50%
LSERS	16.92%	18.01%	18.52%	13.29%	7.50%

Statewide Systems:

System	FY98		FY97		Expected Long Term
	Market Value	Actuarial Value of Assets	Market Value	Actuarial Value of Assets	
ASSR	9.2%	11.9%	8.9%	8.4%	8.0%
CCRS	22.4%	12.2%	15.1%	13.7%	8.0%
DARS	17.9%	10.8%	18.1%	15.3%	8.0%
FRS	11.5%	11.8%	14.7%	8.5%	7.0%
MERSA	16.4%	10.0%	14.1%	9.1%	8.0%
MERSB	16.2%	9.7%	14.7%	9.2%	8.0%
MPERS	14.8%	12.4%	13.9%	13.8%	7.0%
PERSA	18.1%	12.9%	8.5%	13.8%	8.0%
PERSB	16.3%	10.9%	4.6%	8.7%	8.0%
RVRS	12.5%	9.0%	15.1%	9.8%	8.0%
SPRF	14.1%	9.5%	13.8%	9.2%	8.0%

Indices

Indices:	FY98	FY97
	Annual Rate	Annual Rate
CPI ⁽¹⁾	1.7%	2.3%
Lehman Brothers ⁽²⁾	10.5%	8.2%
S&P 500 ⁽³⁾	30.2%	34.7%

Note: Indices are shown for the twelve month period ending June 30, 1998; (1) CPI (All Items), (2) Lehman Brothers Aggregate Bond Index, (3) Standard & Poors' 500 Index

13. Participant Census as of July 30, 1998

Membership

Membership data is provided in the following table. Participants are categorized in one of three categories: active member, retired, or as a current member of the Deferred Retirement Option Plan (DROP).

Participant Census (Payroll in \$millions)

State Systems

System	Actives	Retirees	DROP (current)	Total	% of Total*	FY 1998 Payroll
LASERS	69,949	29,420	2,766	102,135	31.8%	\$1,653.9
TRSL	87,193	42,878	3,195	133,266	41.5%	\$2,485.1
STPOL	947	1,035	60	2,042	0.6%	\$29.6
SCHEMP	14,660	8,361	869	23,890	7.4%	\$225.7
Subtotal	172,749	81,694	6,890	261,333	81.3%	\$4,394.3

Statewide Systems

System	Actives	Retirees	DROP (current)	Total	% of Total*	FY 1998 Payroll
ASSR ⁽¹⁾	679	413	15	1,107	0.3%	\$21.2
CCRS	2,091	682	59	2,832	0.9%	\$51.9
DARS	634	158	5	797	0.2%	\$28.8
FRS	2,567	935	139	3,641	1.1%	\$79.2
MERSA	5,585	2,233	155	7,973	2.5%	\$116.6
MERSB	2,051	716	51	2,818	0.9%	\$38.0
MPERS	4,731	2,986	148	7,865	2.4%	\$131.6
PERSA ⁽²⁾	12,997	4,350	116	17,463	5.4%	\$291.3
PERSB ⁽²⁾	1,686	386	7	2,079	0.6%	\$34.1
RVRS	191	114	15	320	0.1%	\$5.0
SPRF	10,979	1,932	164	13,075	4.1%	\$259.3
Subtotal	44,191	14,905	874	59,970	18.7%	\$1,057.0

(1) Assessors system based on September 30, 1998 valuation

(2) Parochial system based on December 31, 1997 valuation.

* Total for Combined Systems

Combined Systems

All System	Actives	Retirees	DROP (current)	Total	% of Total	FY 1998 Payroll
Total	216,940	96,599	7,764	321,303	100.0%	\$5,451.3

***BENEFIT
FORMULAS
AND
EMPLOYEE
CONTRIBUTIONS***

1. Benefit Accrual Rates

Formula

The retirement benefit for all thirteen systems is generally based on the following formula:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \text{Annual} & & \text{Years of} & & \text{Benefit} & & \text{Final} \\ \text{Benefit at} & = & \text{Service at} & \times & \text{Accrual} & \times & \text{Average} \\ \text{Retirement} & & \text{Retirement} & & \text{Rate} & & \text{Salary at} \\ & & & & & & \text{Retirement} \end{array}$$

The benefit is limited to an amount not greater than final average compensation.

Benefits Accrual Rates & Retirement Eligibility

State Employees

	Benefit Accrual Rate	Years of Service	Age	Member Contribution Rate
Regular	2.50%	10	60	7.50%
	2.50%	25	55	7.50%
	2.50%	30	any age	7.50%
Legislators	3.50%	12	55	11.50%
	3.50%	16	any age	11.50%
	3.50%	20	50	11.50%
Wildlife Agents	25.0% FAS	10	55	8.50%
	37.5% FAS	15	55	8.50%
	55.0% FAS	20	any age	8.50%
	72.5% FAS	25	any age	8.50%
Wildlife retirement benefit is based on percent of Final Average Salary (FAS).				
Corrections Officers Employed Prior to 8/15/86	2.50%	20	any age	9.00%
Corrections Officers Employed on/after 8/15/86	2.50%	20	50	9.00%
Judges	3.50%	18	any age	11.50%
	3.50%	20	50	11.50%
	3.50%	12	55	11.50%
	3.50%	any	70	11.50%
Early retirement – 20 years of service with actuarially reduced benefits.				

Benefits Accrual Rates & Retirement Eligibility

Teachers

	Benefit Accrual Rate	Years of Service	Age	Member Contribution Rate
Regular Teachers	2.00% *	10	60	8.00%
	2.00%**	20	any age	8.00%
	2.50%	20	65	8.00%
	2.50%	25	55	8.00%
	2.50%	30	any age	8.00%
Lunch Plan A	3.00%	10	60	9.10%
	3.00%	25	55	9.10%
	3.00%	30	any age	9.10%
Lunch Plan B	2.00%	10	60	5.00%
	2.00%	30	55	5.00%
* 2.5% for members employed on or after 1/1/99 ** Only for members employed prior to 1/1/99.				
Teacher's early retirement – for members employed on or after 1/1/99; with 20 or more years of service, based on 2.5% accrual rate; actuarially reduced.				

State Police

	Benefit Accrual Rate	Years of Service	Age	Member Contribution Rate
All Employees	2.50%	10	50	8.00%
All Employees*	3.00%	15	50	8.00%
Employed Prior to September 8, 1978	3.00%	20	any age	8.00%
Employed on or after September 9, 1978	3.00%	20	50	8.00%
* Accrued benefit is increased by using a graded rate for accruals earned between 10 and 15 years of service.				

School Employees

	Benefit Accrual Rate	Years of Service	Age	Member Contribution Rate
All Employees	2.50%	10	60	6.35%
	2.50% *	25	55	6.35%
	2.50% *	30	any age	6.35%
*PLUS 0.5% per year for service over 20 years				
Early retirement – 20 years of service with actuarially reduced benefits				

Benefits Accrual Rates & Retirement Eligibility

Assessors

	Benefit Accrual Rate	Years of Service	Age	Member Contribution Rate
All Employees	3.00%	12	55	7.00%
	3.00%	30	50	7.00%

Clerks of Court

	Benefit Accrual Rate	Years of Service	Age	Member Contribution Rate
All Employees	3.00%	12	55	8.25%

District Attorneys

	Benefit Accrual Rate	Years of Service	Age	Member Contribution Rate
Employed Prior to 7/1/90)	3.00%	10	62	7.00%
	3.00%	18	60	7.00%
	3.00%	23	55	7.00%
	3.00%	30	any age	7.00%
(Employed on/after 7/1/90)	3.50%	10	60	7.00%
	3.50%	18	55	7.00%
	3.50%	24	55	7.00%
	3.50%	30	any age	7.00%
Early retirement – eligibility based on years of service and attained age; benefit is reduced by 3% for each year prior to normal retirement.				

Firefighters

	Benefit Accrual Rate	Years of Service	Age	Member Contribution Rate
All Employees	3.33%	12	55	8.00%
	3.33%	20	50	8.00%
	3.33%	25	any age	8.00%

Municipal Employees

	Benefit Accrual Rate	Years of Service	Age	Member Contribution Rate
PLAN A ⁽¹⁾	3.00%	10	60	9.25%
	3.00%	25	55	9.25%
	3.00%	30	any age	9.25%
PLAN B ⁽²⁾	2.00%	10	60	5.00%
	2.00%	30	55	5.00%

Elected officials receive additional 0.5% accrual for each year elected service

1) Pre 10/78 supplemented plan member only = 1% plus \$2 for each month of service prior to 10/78.

2) Plan B members are also covered by Social Security; 3% Reduction for each year below age 62 unless 30 years of service or an elected official with 15 YOS as an elected official.

Benefits Accrual Rates & Retirement Eligibility

Municipal Police

	Benefit Accrual Rate	Years of Service	Age	Member Contribution Rate
All Employees	3.33%	12	55	7.50%
	3.33%	20	50	7.50%
	3.33%	25	any age	7.50%

Parochial Employees

	Benefit Accrual Rate	Years of Service	Age	Member Contribution Rate
PLAN A ⁽¹⁾	3.00%	10	60	9.50%
	3.00%	25	55	9.50%
	3.00%	30	any age	9.50%
PLAN B ⁽²⁾	2.00%	10	60	2.00%
	2.00%	30	55	2.00%
1) For members of the supplemental plan only the accrual rate is 1% plus \$2 for each month of service prior to the revision date.				
2) Plan B members are also covered by Social Security; 3% Reduction for each year below age 62				

Registrars of Voters

	Benefit Accrual Rate	Years of Service	Age	Member Contribution Rate
All Employees	3.00%	10	60	7.00%
	3.00%	20	55	7.00%
	3.00%	30	ANY AGE	7.00%

Sheriffs

	Benefit Accrual Rate	Years of Service	Age	Member Contribution Rate
All Employees	2.50%	12 – 14.9	55	8.70%
	2.75%	15 – 19.9	55	8.70%
	3.00%	20 +	55	8.70%
The accrual rate is increased by 0.25% for service beginning 1/1/1980. Early retirement - based on years of service and attained age; benefit is actuarially reduced.				

2. Benefits

Standard of Living

The following table provides data on two aspects of the retirement benefit. The first portion of the table shows the member's retirement benefit as a percentage of his final average compensation. The retirement benefit is calculated using the three highest consecutive earning years that the member has over his entire salary history. Showing the benefit as a percentage of salary gives some indication of what the member can expect in the way of cash flow as the retirement benefit replaces the earned salary.

Employee Funding

The second part shows what portion of the retirement benefit is funded by employee contributions. The member's contributions are accumulated with interest at the valuation interest rate over the designated time period. The accumulated value is then divided by the actuarial present value of the retirement benefit. This is the percent of the benefit that is funded by the member's own statutorily required contributions.

Hazardous Duty

The membership was divided into two distinctive groups based on the nature of work performed. Benefit plans for employees engaged in hazardous duty have traditionally provided benefits at higher levels than those plans for employees engaged in more normal types of employment.

Hazardous duty personnel are typically members employed in law enforcement and public safety. The group shown on the following page is composed of state police, municipal police, sheriffs and deputies, wildlife enforcement agents, prison guards, and firefighters.

Non-Hazardous Group

		Replacement Ratio			Percent Self-Funded			
		Years of Service at Retirement						
Division	Age	20	30	40	20	30	40	
State Employees	Regular	65	48%	72%	96%	47%	60%	76%
	Legislators	65	67%	96%	96%	59%	71%	99%
	Judges	65	67%	96%	96%	59%	71%	99%
Teachers	Teachers	65	47%	71%	94%	46%	53%	60%
	Lunch A	65	56%	84%	96%	43%	44%	62%
	Lunch B	65	38%	57%	76%	36%	41%	45%
School Employees	Regular	65	48%	87%	97%	42%	43%	66%
Assessors	Regular	65	57%	85%	94%	35%	38%	51%
Clerks of Court	Regular	65	57%	85%	94%	39%	43%	57%
District Attorneys	Regular	65	66%	94%	94%	28%	31%	44%
Municipal Employees	Plan A	65	57%	85%	95%	52%	59%	81%
	Plan B	65	38%	57%	76%	43%	48%	55%
Parochial Employees	Plan A	65	57%	85%	95%	50%	57%	78%
	Plan B	65	38%	57%	76%	15%	17%	20%
Registrars of Voters	Regular	65	56%	84%	94%	9%	31%	39%

Hazardous Group

		Replacement Ratio		Percent Self-Funded	
		Years of Service at Retirement			
Division	Age	20	25	20	25
State Employees					
Wildlife	55	53%	70%	41%	46%
Corrections	55	48%	60%	49%	55%
State Police					
Regular	55	58%	72%	36%	40%
Firefighters'					
Regular	55	64%	80%	29%	32%
Municipal Police					
Regular	55	65%	81%	34%	36%
Sheriffs'					
Regular	55	57%	71%	30%	32%

***ACTUARIAL
CONCERNS***

***FUNDING
ISSUES***

1. Funding of UAL for State Systems

Concern

Paying off the current \$6.123 billion retirement debt (net UAL) for LASERS, TRSL, and STPOL may require increasing employer contributions in the upcoming years.

Amortization Payments

The amortization schedules, adopted in 1992, provide lower payments in the earlier years with higher payments to be made in later years. Under these schedules, the payments increase at 4.5% per year. For the next several years, payments are not sufficient to cover the interest charge on the UAL for either system. As the required payments increase they eventually become large enough to cover both the interest charge and principal portion on the UAL. The law requires full amortization of the initial unfunded accrued liability balance by the year 2029.

**FUTURE AMORTIZATION
PAYMENT RUNOUT
June 30, 1998 UAL BALANCES
(millions)
(At 4.5% Increase Factor)**

State Employees

Fiscal Year	Years Out	Future Amortization Payment
1999	1	\$111.8
2006	8	\$143.9
2014	16	\$204.6
2022	24	\$290.9
2029	31	\$395.9

Teachers

Fiscal Year	Years Out	Future Amortization Payment
1999	1	\$247.6
2006	8	\$315.5
2014	16	\$448.7
2022	24	\$638.2
2029	31	\$868.4

**FUTURE AMORTIZATION
PAYMENT RUNOUT
June 30, 1998 UAL BALANCES
(millions)
(At 4.5% Increase Factor)**

State Police

Fiscal Year	Years Out	Future Amortization Payment
1999	1	\$15.4
2006	8	\$20.1
2014	16	\$2.6
2022	24	\$3.7
2029	31	\$5.0

Combined


Fiscal Year	Years Out	Future Amortization Payment
1999	1	\$374.8
2006	8	\$479.5
2014	16	\$655.9
2022	24	\$932.7
2029	31	\$1,269.3

UAL Run-out

The following graph demonstrates the combined funding progress of our unfunded state retirement systems as of June 30, 1998 balances. The top *dotted* curve illustrates the amortization of the Initial Unfunded Accrued Liability (IUAL) established by statute in 1988. The middle *boxed* curve is the Valuation UAL, which nets all other amortization bases since 1988, including actuarial gain and losses, against the IUAL balance. The bottom *triangled* curve is the Net UAL, which reduces the middle UAL balances by the value of Texaco Funds. The UAL run-out values after 1998 are based on current amortization schedules.

Note: prior to FY 1993 amortization payments are based on Act 81 schedule; subsequent payments are based on Act 257 schedule.

COMBINED UAL BALANCE
Louisiana State Retirement Systems
State Employees - Teachers - State Police
Values as of June 30, 1998



2. Operation of Experience Account

Concern

Although the Experience Account (EA) balance may represent an amount of funds sufficient to cover the expected value of COLA benefits, it does not in itself provide the actual funding necessary to ultimately pay for COLA liabilities.

COLA Funding

The Experience Account is merely a temporary holding account. It does not fund COLA benefits. It only withholds and then releases portions of the investment experience derived from the plan's contributions (and earnings thereon). Those earnings are necessary to meet the actuarial assumed long-term average return of 8.25%. COLA's create additional benefit liability that increases the UAL. It is amortized to the year 2029 and paid with additional employer contributions.

Expected Return

Key to ultimately achieving the expected return is that all investment income is credited to the asset base (contributions and earnings) from which it is derived. If income is diverted for other purposes the assumed rate will not be achieved. This in turn destroys the required match between future benefit payments and assets available to pay for them. Additional contributions will be required from the employer to restore the funding balance between future assets and liabilities.

Impact on UAL

The legislative actuary recommends contribution rates independent of the Experience Account's interference. His assumption is that the Experience Account is just a measuring device that the State can use to grant COLA's. The granting of COLA's is an additional benefit, not a guaranteed right of the participant. The employer has total responsibility for funding liabilities. The participant's contributions are essentially fixed. *The only means to avoid an increase in the \$6.123 billion UAL (Unfunded Liability) is to fund for COLA's in advance, with additional appropriations, not from the plan's earnings.*

**Impact of Experience Account
COLA Benefits on UAL**

**Experience Account Accumulations
as of June 30, 1998
(\$millions)**

System	LASERS	TRSL	Combined
Allocation	\$348.2	\$984.0	\$1,332.2
Interest	\$55.3	\$145.1	\$200.4
Disbursement	\$148.5	\$348.8	\$497.3
Balance	\$255.1	\$780.3	\$1,035.3
Expected COLA Impact on UAL	\$403.5	\$1,129.1	\$1,532.6

3. Change in Asset Funding Method

Concern

A funding method change was implemented with the June 30, 1996 valuation for state systems and MPERS. The adjustment to actuarial value of assets, created by the method change, was treated as additional investment return.

This treatment had a significant impact on the valuation results for LASERS, TRSL and MPERS. The change should have been applied after calculating the past year's annual return so the ending asset basis was consistent with the beginning asset basis.

EA Allocations

It increased the Experience Account allocation by about \$105 million for TRSL and \$76 million for LASERS. As a method change, these amounts should have been applied as a credit to the UAL, creating amortization credits. The State's contribution requirement would have decreased by about 0.2% of payroll for TRSL and 0.5% for LASERS. The impact was especially meaningful for LASERS' 97/98 contribution requirement, which increased to 13.0% from the 12.4% of 96/97.

Returns Overstated

It caused an overstatement of the actuarial return on assets, 17.1% for TRSL versus 13.6%; and 12.3% for LASERS versus 8.1%. Earnings allocated to separate funds were overstated by about 19% for TRSL and 52% for LASERS. Excessive interest rates were credited to DROP accounts.

Actuarial Impact

Temporarily diverting these trust assets has an immediate impact on funding. Its impact on actuarial soundness emerges later with failure to ultimately validate the assumed interest rate. **The impact of granting additional benefits through this COLA measure will be substantial.**

4. Approval Process for Actuarial Reports

Concern

The valuation is becoming increasingly important, especially with the impact of the actuarial interest rate on benefits levels such as DROP and COLAs. More attention should be given to accuracy of the reports and the valuation results.

We recommend that the entire valuation process be reviewed relative to the time frame imposed by the CAFR (Consolidated Annual Financial Report). We are particularly concerned that valuation results are released to the public, appearing official, before an audit is completed by the Legislative Actuary of the Legislative Auditor's Office and approved by the Public Retirement Systems Actuarial Committee.

5. Funding of Optional Retirement Plan

Concern

ORP members are receiving a much higher contribution level than would be warranted if they were participating under the defined benefit plan during their working lifetime.

Based on experience studies, younger eligible employees are joining ORP instead of TRSL. This leaves a higher average age group represented by the remaining TRSL membership of LSU and other university employees. The employer normal cost as percent of payroll is the annual account allocation for the ORP members. It is based on TRSL defined benefit plan valuation results that excludes ORP members. The employer normal cost for the defined benefit plan is increasing as the TRSL group is aging, which directly benefits the younger ORP members at the expense of the employer.

As of December 31, 1998, there were 6,690 participants in ORP.

GROWTH OF ORP MEMBERSHIOP (As Compared to TRSL)

Year	ORP	TRSL	Ratio (ORP to TRSL)
1992	3,775	86,244	4.4%
1993	4,196	85,143	4.9%
1994	4,780	86,079	5.6%
1995	5,290	84,671	6.2%
1996	5,712	84,849	6.7%
1997	6,195	85,169	7.3%
1998	6,690	85,772	7.8%

Note TRSL DROP actives excluded

6. Demographic Experience - TRSL

Concern

For TRSL the ratio of male to female members has steadily declined since 1979. As females become a greater portion of total membership, the cost implications to TRSL can be substantial because of the mortality differential.

In 1979, males represented about 28.9% of the total active group. In 1998, that ratio has dropped to 18.1%. Based on current actuarial assumptions for funding, female annuity purchase rates are 3% higher than male rates at age 40, and 12.3% higher at age 65. Since a greater proportion of females will also enter their retirement years, the cost impact continues and is even greater, for example, at age 80 where the annuity purchase rate is 19.5% higher for females.

Use of sex distinct mortality rates assist in the actuarial funding of an emerging female liability trend. We may expect future increases in TRSL's annual cost because of this trend.

7. Plan Demographics

Concern

There is a decreasing trend in the number of active to inactive members for state and statewide retirement systems. This trend has a direct impact on cash flow and employer funding requirements as benefit payouts accelerate.

Teachers

Based on demographic experience over the last 10 years, fiscal years 1989 through 1998, a trend-line projection indicates that the ratio will be approaching 1.0 over the next 10 to 15 years for TRSL. This will require monitoring of actuarial assumptions to assure that adequate funding is achieved to pay for the accelerated benefit payouts. **In 1989 the ratio of active to inactive members for TRSL stood at 2.77. In 1998 the ratio has decreased to 1.89.**

State Employees

The decline has not been as steep for LASERS, 2.51 in 1989 to 2.17 in 1998. Inactive members in LASERS have consistently increased over the last 10-year period. There has not been a consistent pattern for active members.

School Employees

LSERS pattern is more striking, 3.14 in 1989 to 1.59 in 1998. Active numbers are decreasing, while the number of inactives is increasing. A trend line projection indicates that the ratio is expected to approach 1.0 within the next 4 to 8 years.

State Police

The ratio for State Police has been below 1.0 since 1989. As of 1998, there are 947 active members in STPOL compared to 1,095 inactive members, a ratio of 0.86. This system also has the highest employer contribution rate of the thirteen retirement systems, 63.5% of payroll for fiscal year 2000.

Accrued Liability Trends


As expected, the increasing trend in the number of inactive relative to actives causes a similar pattern with accrued liability. The following table illustrates the impact on emerging liabilities for state plans. Since 1990, the inactive liability has increased

from 44.2% to 54.3% of the total accrued liability. The second set of columns demonstrates the development of funding for active and inactive liabilities. Assets are first allocated to cover 100% of the inactive liabilities. The remainder is then compared to active liabilities. Since 1990, the active funded ratio has increased from 14.0% to 50.5%.

Combined State System Liability Funding Trends

Percent of Total Accrued Liability		
Fiscal Year:	Actives	Inactives
1990	55.8%	44.2%
1991	56.8%	43.2%
1992	56.4%	43.6%
1993	55.2%	44.8%
1994	53.2%	46.8%
1995	51.6%	48.4%
1996	47.4%	52.6%
1997	47.0%	53.0%
1998	45.7%	54.3%

Percent of Total Accrued Liability



Combined State System Liability Funding Trends

Percent Funded			
Fiscal Year:	Actives	Inactives	Combined
1990	14.0%	100.0%	52.0%
1991	17.1%	100.0%	52.9%
1992	21.2%	100.0%	55.6%
1993	25.7%	100.0%	59.0%
1994	29.5%	100.0%	62.5%
1995	29.1%	100.0%	63.4%
1996	31.8%	100.0%	67.7%
1997	39.6%	100.0%	71.6%
1998	50.5%	100.0%	77.4%

Statewide Systems

The statewide retirement systems show varying degrees of change in the ratio of active to inactive members over the 10-year period 1989 to 1998.

Ratio of Active To Retired Population			
Fiscal Year:	1989	1998	Trend
ASSR	1.86	1.68	↙
CCRS	3.31	3.15	↙
DARS	4.98	4.04	↙
FRS	2.65	2.75	↗
MERSA	2.83	2.57	↙
MERSB	2.93	2.94	↗
MPERS	1.55	1.51	↙
PERSA	3.29	3.01	↙
PERSB	3.47	4.39	↗
RVRS	2.05	1.81	↙
SPRF	4.99	5.77	↗

8. Impact of COLA Increases on Retiree Benefits

Concern

The average benefit since retirement of a retiree from the four state retirement systems has increased 1.4% per year. Comparable to this period, the CPI (Consumer Price Index) has increased an average of 3.2% per year. The 1.8% difference has narrowed sharply compared to the 2.6% spread in our 6/30/96 study with values of 1.1% and 3.7%, respectively.

COLA Policy

At the request of the legislature, the legislative actuary in the Legislative Auditor's Office has studied the impact of inflation on retiree benefit levels. Unfortunately, the state has had to focus on improving the funding position for future benefits that are promised by law. This has left any provisions for retiree COLA increases to erratic solutions and special interest legislation. Existing methods have not given desired results and leave retirees unsure of the state's policy toward COLAs. Also of concern is the impact that these ad hoc methods will ultimately have on overall funding. Since providing our Experience Account analysis to the Legislature, we have continued to focus on two issues:

1. The current method of detouring fund assets to measure COLA benefit increases, through the Experience Account, impacts the actuarial soundness of the funding methods and interest assumptions.
2. The study of retiree benefits and COLAs relate to employer/state benefit objectives and budgeting concerns. The adequacy and level of our retirees' benefits should be determined by the state, since the state, and related employers, are ultimately responsible for payment of all promised benefits.

For comparison, the following exhibit displays the average annual rates for actual benefit (COLA) increases and CPI inflation increases, for those who retired 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30 and 35 years ago.

**AVERAGE ANNUAL BENEFIT INCREASE
FOR RETIREES SINCE RETIREMENT**

**Average Annual Rate of Increase
From Retirement Date to 6/30/98**

State Employees

Years Retired	Average Annual Rate of Increase
0	0.0%
5	0.7%
10	0.7%
15	1.3%
20	2.3%
25	2.4%
30	2.5%
35	2.0%
GROUP WTD. AVG.	1.3%

Teachers

Years Retired	Average Annual Rate of Increase
0	0.0%
5	1.0%
10	0.8%
15	1.2%
20	2.2%
25	2.1%
30	2.1%
35	1.9%
GROUP WTD. AVG.	1.3%

School Employees

Years Retired	Average Annual Rate of Increase
0	0.0%
5	3.1%
10	3.1%
15	2.8%
20	3.6%
25	3.1%
30	2.9%
35	2.2%
GROUP WTD. AVG.	3.0%

**AVERAGE ANNUAL BENEFIT INCREASE
FOR RETIREES SINCE RETIREMENT**

**Average Annual Rate of Increase
From Retirement Date to 6/30/98**

State Police

Years Retired	Avg. Annual Rate of Increase
0	0.0%
5	0.6%
10	0.2%
15	0.8%
20	1.6%
25	1.6%
30	1.8%
35	2.0%
GROUP WTD. AVG.	0.8%

Consumer Price Index

Years Retired	Avg. Annual Rate of Increase
0	0.0%
5	2.5%
10	3.3%
15	3.3%
20	4.7%
25	5.4%
30	5.3%
35	4.9%
GROUP WTD. AVG.	3.2%
Consumer Price Index (CPI) - All Urban Consumers: All Items; Not seasonally adjusted; U.S. City average	

9. Minimum Employer Contribution Limits Under State Constitution

Funding Issue

Louisiana's Constitution requires the legislature to set the member's contribution such that it will not exceed a fixed portion of the total contribution to the retirement system until the original UAL established in 1988 is fully funded. For example, to comply with the requirements, the employer must contribute at least 12 percent for LASERS and 11.8 percent for TRSL based on the employee contribution rates. Upon elimination of the original UAL, the member's contribution cannot exceed the amount contributed on his behalf by the employer.

LSER (School Employees') is the only state system that has eliminated the original unfunded liability. For this system, the constitutionally required employer contribution of 6.0% of payroll will exceed the actuarially projected contribution of 2.2% of payroll for FY 2000. This will require an overpayment by the employer of \$8.9 million.